

## Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 03776 061402Z

42

ACTION ACDA-19

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 ISO-00 AEC-11 CIAE-00 H-03 INR-10 IO-14

L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-04 OMB-01 PA-04 PM-07 PRS-01 SAJ-01

SAM-01 SP-03 SS-20 USIA-15 TRSE-00 RSC-01 NSC-07 EB-11

DRC-01 /163 W

----- 031485

R 061255Z JUL 74

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC 6660

SECDEF WASHDC

INFO USDEL MBFR VIENNA

AMEMBASSY ANKARA

AMEMBASSY ATHENS

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY COPENHAGEN

AMEMBASSY OSLO

USCINCEUR

USNMR SHAPE

S E C R E T USNATO 3776

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM, NATO

SUBJECT: MBFR: SPC JULY 5 DISCUSSION OF FLANK SECURITY

REF:A. USNATO 2586; B. USNATO 3301; C. USNATO 2798; D. USNATO 2812;  
E. USNATO 3744

BEGIN SUMMARY: BELGIANS INTRODUCED OCOMPROMISE FORMULATION ON  
FLANK SECURITY AT JULY 5 SPC . GREEK, TURKISH, NORWEGIAN,  
DUTCH, ITALIAN AND UK REPS INDICATED INTEREST. SPC NEXT  
CONSIDERS FLANK SECURITY ON JULY 15. END SUMMARY.

1. SPC JULY 5 RETURNED TO QUESTION OF FLANK SECURITY.
2. BELGIAN REP (VAN ROEY) INTRODUCED COMPROMISE FORMULATION  
SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 03776 061402Z

WHICH READS AS FOLLOWS: "FORCES WITHDRAWN ACCORDING TO THE  
PRESENT AGREEMENT WILL NOT BE REDEPLOYED, DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY,  
IN GEOGRAPHICAL REGIONS WHERE THEIR ADDED PRESENCE WOULD EITHER  
INFRINGE THE PRINCIPLE THAT FORCE REDUCTIONS IN CENTRAL EUROPE

SHOULD NOT DIMINISH THE SECURITY OF THOSE COUNTRIES HAVING PARTICIPATED IN THE NEGOTIATIONS WITH SPECIAL STATUS, OR CIRCUMVENT THE OBJECTIVE PURSUED IN THIS AGREEMENT OF ENHANCING STABILITY AND SECURITY IN CENTRAL EUROPE." BELGIAN REP NOTED THAT PREVIOUS GREEK AND DUTCH FORMULATIONS HAD NOT BEEN ACCEPTED BY SPC AND HOPED BELGIAN FORMULATION WHICH DREW FROM BOTH COULD CONSTITUTE BASIS OF ACCORD.

3. TURKISH REP FOUND BELGIAN FORMULATION VERY INTERESTING AND THOUGHT SUCH A CONTRIBUTION NECESSARY TO ACCELERATE SPC WORK ON FLANK SECURITY. HE NOTED, HOWEVER, REMOVAL OF GREEK REFERENCE TO NON-REDEPLOYMENT OF FORCES WITHDRAWN FROM REDUCTION AREAS INTO AREAS ADJACENT TO SPECIAL STATUS PARTICIPANTS. HE NOTED ALSO THE PROBLEM OF DEPLOYMENT OF OTHER THAN WITHDRAWN FORCES. HE ASKED IF THE BELGIAN REFERENCE TO REDEPLOYMENT "DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY" WAS INTENDED TO COVER THESE ISSUES. BELGIAN REP REPLIED THAT THESE WORDS WERE SO INTENDED.

4. NORWEGIAN REP ALSO FOUND BELGIAN FORMULATION VERY INTERESTING BUT NOTED THAT UNDIMINISHED SECURITY APPLIES TO ALL PARTICIPANTS, NOT JUST THOSE WITH SPECIAL STATUS AS STATED IN BELGIAN FORMULATION.

5. NETHERLANDS REP PICKED UP THIS POINT AND ALSO NOTED THAT OBJECTIVE OF ENHANCING STABILITY AND SECURITY APPLIES NOT JUST TO CENTRAL EUROPE AS IN BELGIAN FORMULATION BUT TO WHOLE ALLIANCE. HE ALSO NOTED THAT WILLOT, THE AUTHOR OF BELGIAN FORMULATION, HAD CONFIRMED TO HIM THE MEANING OF "DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY" IN THE SAME WAY VAN ROEY UNDERSTOOD IT. NETHERLANDS REP ALSO POINTED OUT DUTCH PROPOSAL (REF A, PARA 5) CALLED FOR CONSULTATION PROCEDURE BUT BELGIAN FORMULATION DOES NOT. HOWEVER, SEPARATE BELGIAN PROPOSAL FOR PARA 37 OF C-M(73)83 (REVIEW AND WITHDRAWAL PROVISION) DOES CALL FOR CONSULTATION PROCEDURE. (REF B). THEREFORE THIS DUTCH POINT MAY BE COVERED.

6. ITALY THOUGHT BELGIAN FORMULATION SEEMED ACCEPTABLE BUT WAS A LITTLE VAGUE IN NOT STRICTLY DEFINING THE GEOGRAPHIC REGIONS WHERE ADDED PRESENCE OBJECTIONABLE. UK REP SAW  
SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 03776 061402Z

PROBLEM WITH BELGIAN PHRASE "REDEPLOYED, DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY, IN GEOGRAPHICAL REGIONS WHERE THEIR ADDED PRESENCE...". UK WANTED TO PRESERVE FREEDOM OF MOVEMENT OF ACE MOBILE FORCE. HE THEREFOR PREFERRED SIMPLE DUTCH FORMULATION "NOT TO REDEPLOY THEIR FORCES IN MANNER INCONSISTENT WITH PRINCIPLE OF UNDIMINISHED SECURITY ". HE ALSO NOTED THAT ALTHOUGH HE FOUND BELGIAN PROPOSAL VERY INTERESTING UK COULD ALSO WORK WITH EITHER DUTCH OR GREEK FORMULATION (REF C) ALTHOUGH EITHER WOULD REQUIRE MODIFICATIONS.

7. US REP, SPEAKING PERSONALLY, SAID BELGIAN FORMULATION SEEMED TO HIM A SERIOUS EFFORT AT COMPROMISE. HE WELCOMED ITS MORE GENERAL REFERENCE TO GEOGRAPHIC REGIONS. HE SAID HE

WOULD REPORT THE PROPOSAL AND THE REACTIONS TO IT PROMPTLY TO WASHINGTON.

8. GREEK REP CALLED THE BELGIAN PROPOSAL A WELL INTENDED ATTEMPT AT COMPROMISE. HE THOUGHT UK CONCERN ABOUT ACE MOBILE FORCE WAS HANDLED BY REFERENCE TO EXCEPTIONS FOR NORMAL EXERCISES AND ROTATIONS CONTAINED IN GREEK FORMULATION. HE OBSERVED THAT IF OTHER DELEGATIONS WERE PREPARED TO ACCEPT THE BELGIAN FORMULATION, ESPECIALLY THE US, THE GREEKS WOULD CONSIDER IT IN A POSITIVE SPIRIT.

9. SPC AGREED TO RETURN TO BELGIAN AND OTHER FORMULATIONS ON MONDAY, JULY 15.

10. COMMENT: BELGIAN FORMULATION IS SUBSTANTIALLY THAT REPORTED IN REF D, PARA 8, WITH MODIFICATION OF ORIGINAL BELGIAN REFERENCE TO INDIMINISHED SECURITY FOR ALL PARTICIPANTS, AND WITH ADDITION OF NON-CIRCUMVENTION NOTION DRAWN FROM DUTCH PAPER. MISSION WISHES TO REITERATE NEED OR FORTHCOMING US REACTION TO BELGIAN PROPOSAL AT JULY 15 SPC, AS RECOMMENDED IN REF E. RUMSFELD

SECRET

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

## Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptioning:** X  
**Capture Date:** 11 JUN 1999  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** n/a  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Draft Date:** 06 JUL 1974  
**Decaption Date:** 01 JAN 1960  
**Decaption Note:**  
**Disposition Action:** RELEASED  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Authority:** golinofr  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Date:** 28 MAY 2004  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1974ATO03776  
**Document Source:** ADS  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:** n/a  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** 11652 GDS  
**Errors:** n/a  
**Film Number:** n/a  
**From:** NATO  
**Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1974/newtext/t19740788/abbrywan.tel  
**Line Count:** 131  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE  
**Office:** n/a  
**Original Classification:** SECRET  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 3  
**Previous Channel Indicators:**  
**Previous Classification:** SECRET  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Reference:** A. USNATO 2586; B. USNATO 3301; C. USNATO 2798; D. USNATO 2812; E. USNATO 3744  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Authority:** golinofr  
**Review Comment:** n/a  
**Review Content Flags:**  
**Review Date:** 20 MAR 2002  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review History:** RELEASED <20 MAR 2002 by izenbei0>; APPROVED <09 MAY 2002 by golinofr>  
**Review Markings:**

Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
30 JUN 2005

**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Referrals:** n/a  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** NATIVE  
**Subject:** MBFR: SPC JULY 5 DISCUSSION OF FLANK SECURITY  
**TAGS:** PARM, NATO  
**To:** STATE  
SECDEF INFO MBFR VIENNA  
ANKARA  
ATHENS  
BONN  
COPENHAGEN  
OSLO

USCINCEUR  
USNMR SHAPE

**Type:** TE

**Markings:** Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005